



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

H 7

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/753,241	01/08/2004	Arne W. Ballantine	END9-2000-0100US2	7960
30449	7590	11/13/2006	EXAMINER	
SCHMEISER, OLSEN & WATTS 22 CENTURY HILL DRIVE SUITE 302 LATHAM, NY 12110			TSAL, H JEY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2812	

DATE MAILED: 11/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/753,241

Applicant(s)

BALLANTINE ET AL.

Examiner

H.Jey Tsai

Art Unit

2812

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 October 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 4,5,10-12,16,20,23,24,47,49-73 and 76 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 4-5, 10-12, 16, 20, 23-24, 47, 49-73, 76 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

In view of the response filed on Oct. 26, 2006, the finality as set forth in the last office action is withdrawn. Examiner inadvertently listed claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gofuku et al. Examiner also inadvertently failed to list claim 58 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gofuku et al. Claims 5, 10-12, 55-58, 61-62, 67, 69 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gofuku et al.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 5, 10-12, 55-58, 61-62, 67, 69 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gofuku et al. 4,785,157, previously applied.

Gofuku et al. teaches method for increasing an electrical resistance of a resistor, comprising the steps of:

providing a semiconductor structure 1 (IC or silicon) that includes the resistor 1, fig. 1-3, col. 2, lines 34-40, col. 5, lines 30-35, col. 6, line 30,

placing the semiconductor structure 1 in a chamber (vessel), col. 6, lines 54-60,

heating a portion of surface layer 1 (with laser beam 6, 7) at a heating temperature (controlling temperature with laser beam irradiation to change the electric

Art Unit: 2812

resistance of surface layer 1, see col. 3, lines 6-14, col. 2, lines 50-54 and claim 1), wherein an exterior surface of the portion consist essentially of fraction F (spot on the surface 1 by laser 6, 7) of the exterior surface of the surface layer 1 and wherein a combination of the oxygen concentration and the heating temperature is sufficient to oxidize the portion of surface layer by reacting the portion with oxygen comprising molecules (col. 6, lines 24-44), wherein heating the portion of the surface layer includes directing a beam (laser beam 6, 7) into the portion of the surface layer 1 such that beam (laser beam 6, 7) cause the heating of the portion of the surface layer and wherein the beam is selected form laser beam,

oxidizing a fraction F (spot on the surface by laser 6, 7) of a surface layer 1 of the resistor with oxygen particles (oxygen, a gas, see col. 6, lines 34-68) either flowing or non-flowing (blowing oxygen on the spot which is flowing or a sealed vessel (chamber) with a window filled with gas which is non-flowing) and includes directing a laser beam onto the surface and heating the surface (controlling the temperature, col. 3, lines 6-14), resulting in the increasing of the electrical resistance of the resistor, with fraction of $F < 1$ less than resistor layer 1 (spot of layer 6 and 7 is less than resistor layer 1), col. 2, lines 50-51, col. 5, lines 1-68, col. 6, lines 1-36, col. 6, lines 34-68,

regarding claim 10, beam is a laser beam radiation 6, 7, col. 6, lines 34-68,

regarding claim 11, wherein fraction of $F < 1$ less than resistor layer 1 (spot of layer 6 and 7 is less than resistor layer 1),

regarding claim 12, F can be equal to 1, when laser beam 6, 7 scans entire surface of resistor layer 1, fig. 1,

regarding claim 55, wherein the thickness of the oxidized portion of the surface being increasing function of an energy flux of the beam (output power, number of pulses and pulse width, etc), col.6, lines 8-32 and claims 3-5,

Art Unit: 2812

regarding claim 56, 62, the surface layer is no smaller than beam size 6, 7, fig. 2,
regarding claim 57, the gas is flowing, col. 6, lines 54-60,
regarding claim 58, the gas is non-flowing, col. 6, lines 54-60,
regarding claims 61, 69, laser beam is a pulsed laser beam, col. 4, line 50.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4, 47, 63, 64-65, 71-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mochizuki 4,533,935, in view of Gofuku et al. 4,785,157, both are previously cited.

The reference(s) teach the features:

Mochizuki teaches method for increasing an electrical resistance of a resistor, comprising the steps of:

providing a semiconductor structure that includes the resistor 26, fig. 5c, or 6a-6e, col. 3, lines 38-49, col. 4, lines 22-42,

oxidizing a fraction F of a surface layer of the resistor with oxygen particles (dry oxygen, a gas) or NH₃ or nitrogen (a gas, also meeting claim 70), resulting in the

Art Unit: 2812

increasing of the electrical resistance of the resistor 26, with fraction of $F < 1$ less than conductive layer 18, col. 3, lines 38-49, col. 4, lines 50-51, col. 5, lines 1-68, col. 6, lines 1-36,

gas is either inherently can be flowing or non-flowing,

wherein a dimension of the portion of the resistor does not exceed about 1 micron, col. 5, lines 1-13,

regarding claim 63, 71, wherein the oxygen comprising particles comprises oxygen comprising molecules (dry oxygen, O_2), col. 3, lines 38-49, col. 4, lines 38-40.

The difference between the reference(s) and the claims are as follows: Mochizuki et al. teaches oxidizing a fraction F of a surface layer of the resistor with oxygen particles in atmosphere of dry oxygen gas or NH_3 or nitrogen gas, resulting in the increasing of the electrical resistance of the resistor with fraction of $F < 1$ less than conductive layer and the resistor does not exceed about 1 micron (also meeting claim 66) but does not teaches the gas is flowing or not flowing. However, Gofuku et al. teaches at col. 6, lines 34-68, oxidizing a fraction F (spot on the surface by laser 6, 7) of a surface layer 1 of the resistor with oxygen particles (oxygen, a gas,) either flowing (blowing) and including directing a beam onto the surface on the spot which is flowing (also meeting claims 64, 72) or non-flowing oxygen a sealed vessel (chamber) with a window filled with gas which is non-flowing (also meeting claims 65, 73) to increase the electrical resistance of the resistor. Gofuku et al. also teaches with fraction of $F < 1$ less than resistor layer 1 (spot of layer 6 and 7 is less than resistor layer 1), col. 2, lines 50-51, col. 5, lines 1-68, col. 6, lines 1-36, col. 6, lines 34-68, wherein a dimension of the

Art Unit: 2812

portion of the resistor does not exceed about 1 micron, col. 5, lines 1-13, beam is a laser beam radiation 6, 7, col. 6, lines 34-68, F can be equal to 1, when laser beam 6, 7 scans entire surface of resistor layer 1, fig. 1.

And, and the specific dimension of resistor as claimed are taken to be obvious since these are variables of art recognized importance which are subject to routine experimentation and optimization and discovery of an optimum value for a known process is obvious. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1955). And, even if applicants' modification results in great improvement and utility over the prior art, it may still not be patentable if the modification was within the capabilities of one skilled in the art, In Re Sola 25 USPQ 433.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have recognized Mochizuki's gas oxidizing atmosphere can be flowing (blowing) or non-flowing (sealed vessel filled with gas) as taught by Gofuku et al. because process gas atmosphere for the micron scale semiconductor device either flowing or non-flowing would oxidized the surface of a resistor layer to increase the resistance of a resistor.

Claims 16, 20, 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Basseches et al. 3,148,129 in view of Poisel 4,485,370, Mochizuki 4,533,935, previously applied, and Lerner 5,167,935, newly cited.

The reference(s) teach the features:

Art Unit: 2812

Basseches et al. discloses a method for increasing an electrical resistance of a resistor:

forming an anodization electrical circuit which includes: a DC power supply 7, 8, 9, 10, an electrolytic solution 5 comprising oxygen (water, nitric, acetic. Citric, oxalic acid, nitric acid HNO_3 containing NO_3 gas particles), the resistor 3 partially immersed in the electrolytic solution 5, and a cathode 6 partially immersed in the electrolytic solution 5, wherein the resistor 3 (with an resistance layer, col. 2, lines 10-11) is electrically coupled to a positive terminal of the DC power supply such that the resistor 3 serves as an anode, and wherein the cathode is electrically coupled to a negative terminal of the DC power supply, fig. 2 and col. 2, lines 10-71, lines 45-60, col. 2, lines 38-45,

activating (initiated by closing the switch 8) the DC power supply such that the DC power supply generates a voltage output, wherein the voltage output causes an electrolytic reaction in the electrolytic solution near the resistor 3, wherein the electrolytic reaction generates oxygen ions from the oxygen in the electrolytic solution, and wherein the oxygen particles include the oxygen ions; and oxidizing the fraction of the surface layer with the oxygen ions to increase the resistance of resistor 3, col. 2, lines 37-54, (meeting claim 16),

testing (monitoring with monitor means 10) the resistor 3 during the oxidizing step to determine the desired resistance has been attained, col. 2, lines 39-55, col. 3, lines 3-60,

providing a semiconductor structure that includes the resistor 3,

providing a chemical solution which includes oxygen particles in an oxygen-comprising gas dissolved in the chemical solution under pressurization,

immersing the semiconductor structure 3 in the chemical solution 5, wherein a fraction F of an exterior surface of a surface layer of the resistor is immersed in the electrolytic solution 5, an electrolytic solution 5 comprising oxygen (water, nitric, acetic, Citric, oxalic acid, nitric acid HNO_3 containing NO_3 gas particles), fig. 2,

exposing the fraction F of the exterior surface of the surface layer of the resistor 3 to the oxygen particles (electrolytic solution 5 comprising oxygen),

oxidizing a portion of the surface layer of the resistor by chemically reacting the oxygen particles with the portion of the surface layer such that an electrical resistance of the resistor is increased, wherein an exterior surface of said portion consists essentially of the fraction F of an exterior surface of the surface layer 3, and wherein $F < 1$, col. 2, lines 37-54, (meeting claim 20).

The difference between the reference(s) and the claims are as follows:

Basseches et al. teaches increasing an electrical resistance of a resistor on a substrate by using anodization process but does not teaches the resistor can be formed in a semiconductor structure. However, Poisel teaches at col. 3, lines 40-67, forming a resistor in an integrated circuit (a semiconductor structure) by using anodization and nitridation process to increase the resistance of a resistor. Mochizuki et al. teaches at col. 5, lines 1-13, forming a resistor portion of less than one micron. Lerner teaches at abstract, col. 5, lines 1-65, col. 8, lines 34-43, nitric acid reacting to oxygen under

Art Unit: 2812

pressurized vessel to produce nitric acid. And, merely change in size of a resistor surface is not patentable, see MPEP § 2144.04, § IV as follow:

In re Rose , 220 F.2d 459, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955) (Claims directed to a lumber package "of appreciable size and weight requiring handling by a lift truck" where held unpatentable over prior art lumber packages which could be lifted by hand because limitations relating to the size of the package were not sufficient to patentably distinguish over the prior art.); In re Rinehart, 531 F.2d 1048, 189 USPQ 143 (CCPA 1976) ("mere scaling up of a prior art process capable of being scaled up, if such were the case, would not establish patentability in a claim to an old process so scaled." 531 F.2d at 1053, 189 USPQ at 148.). In Gardner v. TEC Systems, Inc., 725 F.2d 1338, 220 USPQ 777 (Fed. Cir. 1984), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 830, 225 USPQ 232 (1984), the Federal Circuit held that, where the only difference between the prior art and the claims was a recitation of relative dimensions of the claimed device and a device having the claimed relative dimensions would not perform differently than the prior art device, the claimed device was not patentably distinct from the prior art device.

And the specific dimension of resistor as claimed are taken to be obvious since these are variables of art recognized importance which are subject to routine experimentation and optimization and discovery of an optimum value for a known process is obvious. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1955). And, even if applicants' modification results in great improvement and utility over the prior art, it may still not be patentable if the modification was within the capabilities of one skilled in the art, In Re Sola 25 USPQ 433.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Basseches et al. process by forming a resistor in the semiconductor structure (integrated circuit) as suggested by Poisel because resistor can be as a part of integrated circuit such RC circuits. And, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Basseches et al. process by forming a resistor in the semiconductor

Art Unit: 2812

structure with dimension not exceed about one micron as suggested by Mochizuki because resistor is formed inside the semiconductor device which dimension is only few micron scale, therefore, the resistor must be in sub-micron range. And, It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Basseches et al.'s process by using a nitric acid formed from pressurized oxygen as oxidizing solution as suggested by Lerner because nitric acid reacts with oxygen under pressurized vessel to produce a final product of nitric acid containing pure NO_3 without NO_x .

Claims 49-50, 66 and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103 as being unpatentable over Basseches et al. in view of Poisel as applied to claims 16, 20, 23-24 above, and further in view of Mochizuki 4,533,935, Gofuku et al. 4,785,157 and Skill level of an ordinary person in the art, previously cited.

The difference between the references applied above and the instant claim(s) is: Basseches et al. teaches increasing the resistance in a portion of a resistor but does not teach specific dimension of the resistor. However, Mochizuki et al. teaches at col. 5, lines 1-13, forming a resistor portion of less than one micron. And, Gofuku et al. teaches at fig. 1, wherein fraction of $F < 1$ less than resistor layer 1 (spot of layer 6 and 7 is less than resistor layer 1) and F can be equal to 1, when laser beam 6, 7 scans entire surface of resistor layer 1. And, merely change in size of a resistor surface is not patentable, see MPEP § 2144.04, § IV as follow:

In re Rose , 220 F.2d 459, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955) (Claims directed to a lumber package "of appreciable size and weight requiring handling by a lift truck" where held unpatentable over prior art lumber packages which could be lifted by hand because limitations relating to the size of the package were not sufficient to patentably distinguish

Art Unit: 2812

over the prior art.); In re Rinehart, 531 F.2d 1048, 189 USPQ 143 (CCPA 1976) ("mere scaling up of a prior art process capable of being scaled up, if such were the case, would not establish patentability in a claim to an old process so scaled." 531 F.2d at 1053, 189 USPQ at 148.). In Gardner v. TEC Systems, Inc., 725 F.2d 1338, 220 USPQ 777 (Fed. Cir. 1984), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 830, 225 USPQ 232 (1984), the Federal Circuit held that, where the only difference between the prior art and the claims was a recitation of relative dimensions of the claimed device and a device having the claimed relative dimensions would not perform differently than the prior art device, the claimed device was not patentably distinct from the prior art device.

And the specific dimension of resistor as claimed are taken to be obvious since these are variables of art recognized importance which are subject to routine experimentation and optimization and discovery of an optimum value for a known process is obvious. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1955). And, even if applicants' modification results in great improvement and utility over the prior art, it may still not be patentable if the modification was within the capabilities of one skilled in the art, In Re Sola 25 USPQ 433.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above references' teachings with a resistor less than 1 micron and $F=1$ or $F<1$ as taught by Mochizuki et al. and Gofuku et al. because the small dimension of resistor can be used in the integrated circuit.

Claim 59 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103 as being unpatentable over Gofuku et al. as applied to claims 5, 10-12, 55- 58, 61-62, 67, 69 above, and further in view of Mochizuki et al. 4,533,935 and Skill level of an ordinary person in the art, previously applied.

The difference between the references applied above and the instant claim(s) is: Gofuku teaches increasing the resistance in a portion of a resistor but does not teach specific dimension of the resistor. However, Mochizuki teaches at col. 5, lines 1-13,

Art Unit: 2812

forming a resistor portion of less than 1 micron. And, merely change in size of a resistor surface is not patentable, see MPEP § 2144.04, § IV as follow:

In re Rose , 220 F.2d 459, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955) (Claims directed to a lumber package "of appreciable size and weight requiring handling by a lift truck" where held unpatentable over prior art lumber packages which could be lifted by hand because limitations relating to the size of the package were not sufficient to patentably distinguish over the prior art.); In re Rinehart, 531 F.2d 1048, 189 USPQ 143 (CCPA 1976) ("mere scaling up of a prior art process capable of being scaled up, if such were the case, would not establish patentability in a claim to an old process so scaled." 531 F.2d at 1053, 189 USPQ at 148.). In Gardner v. TEC Systems, Inc., 725 F.2d 1338, 220 USPQ 777 (Fed. Cir. 1984), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 830, 225 USPQ 232 (1984), the Federal Circuit held that, where the only difference between the prior art and the claims was a recitation of relative dimensions of the claimed device and a device having the claimed relative dimensions would not perform differently than the prior art device, the claimed device was not patentably distinct from the prior art device.

And the specific dimension of resistor as claimed are taken to be obvious since these are variables of art recognized importance which are subject to routine experimentation and optimization and discovery of an optimum value for a known process is obvious. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1955). And, even if applicants' modification results in great improvement and utility over the prior art, it may still not be patentable if the modification was within the capabilities of one skilled in the art, In Re Sola 25 USPQ 433.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above references' teachings with a resistor less than 1 micron because the dimension of a resistor determine the resistance of a resistor and such resistance value is taken to be obvious since these are variables of art recognized importance which are subject to routine experimentation and optimization and discovery of an optimum value for a known process is obvious.

Claim 60 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103 as being unpatentable over Gofuku et al. as applied to claims 5, 10-12, 55- 58, 61-62, 67, 69 above, and further in view of Background of the invention of Gofuku et al. 4,785,157.

The difference between the references applied above and the instant claim(s) is: Gofuku teaches increasing the resistance in a portion of a resistor using a pulsed laser but does not teach using continuous laser beam in the main body of the invention. However, Gofuku et al. teaches at Background of the invention, using a continuous laser beam or a pulsed laser beam to control the resistance value of a resistor.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above references' teachings with a continuous laser beam because continuous laser also can change the resistance value of a resistor.

Claims 51-54, 68 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C 103 as being unpatentable over Gofuku et al. as applied to claims 5, 10-12, 55- 58, 61-62, 67, 69, above, and further in view of Wang et al. 5,547,881 and Blanchard 4,707,909, previously applied.

The difference between the references applied above and the instant claim(s) is: Gofuku et al. teaches increasing the resistance in a portion of a resistor with laser beam radiation and oxygen gas but does not teach using electron beam or ion beam and using nitrogen gas. However, Wang teaches at col.4, lines 1-17, using ion beam radiation and nitrogen to change the resistivity of a resistor. And, Blanchard teaches at col. 3, lines 23-36, using electron beam radiation to change the resistivity of an resistor

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above references' teachings with ion beam or

electron beam and/or nitrogen to change the resistivity because ion beam or electron beam would react with the resistor so that the resistivity is altered.

Claim 70 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103 as being unpatentable over Mochizuki in view of Gofuku et al. as applied to claims 4, 47, 63, 64-66, 71-73, above, and further in view of Wang et al. 5,547,881 and Blanchard 4,707,909, previously applied.

The difference between the references applied above and the instant claim(s) is: Mochizuki in view of Gofuku et al. teaches increasing the resistance in a portion of a resistor with laser beam radiation and oxygen gas but does not teach using nitrogen gas. However, Wang teaches at col.4, lines 1-17, using ion beam radiation and nitrogen to change the resistivity of a resistor. And, Blanchard teaches at col. 3, lines 23-36, using electron beam radiation to change the resistivity of an resistor.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above references' teachings with ion beam or electron beam and/or nitrogen to change the resistivity because ion beam or electron beam would react with the resistor so that the resistivity is altered.

Conclusions

Applicant's arguments filed Oct. 26, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Because Mochizuki clearly teaches treating the resistor layer in dry oxygen gas, hence the gas is either flowing or non-flowing. Applicant's contend that gas can be partially flowing and partially non-flowing. This not found persuasive because Applicant has not presented evidence using oxidizing gas partially flowing and partially non-

flowing to oxidized micron scale device in the semiconductor processing art. However, Gofuku teaches using flowing (blowing) or non-flowing (filled in sealed vessel) to oxidize the resistor surface as set forth above. Gofuku clearly teach at col. 6, lines 34-68 and fig. 1-2, blowing oxygen on the spot (fraction of resistor layer 1) which is flowing or a sealed vessel with a window filled with gas which is non-flowing oxidizing on the spot of layer beam 6, 7, resulting in the increasing of the electrical resistance of the resistor 1. The spot size (fraction of F) is less than resistor layer 1. heating a portion of surface layer 1 (with laser beam 6, 7) at a heating temperature (controlling temperature with laser beam irradiation to change the electric resistance of surface layer 1, see col. 3, lines 6-14, col. 2, lines 50-54 and claim 1), wherein an exterior surface of the portion consist essentially of fraction F (spot on the surface 1 by laser 6, 7) of the exterior surface of the surface layer 1 and wherein a combination of the oxygen concentration and the heating temperature is sufficient to oxidize the portion of surface layer by reacting the portion with oxygen comprising molecules (col. 6, lines 24-44), wherein heating the portion of the surface layer includes directing a beam (laser beam 6, 7) into the portion of the surface layer 1 such that beam (laser beam 6, 7) cause the heating of the portion of the surface layer and wherein the beam is selected form laser beam as set forth above. And, there is not see any difference between Gofuku's teaching of using laser beam irradiation to increase the resistivity of resistor surface layer by reacting surface with oxygen and the instant invention. When the prior art device is the same as a device described in the specification for carrying out the claimed method, it can be assumed the device will inherently perform the claimed process. In re King, 801 F.2d 1324, 231 USPQ 136 (Fed. Cir. 1986), MPEP §2112.02. Gofuku et al. also teaches at col.6, lines 8-32 and claims 3-5, changing laser beam irradiation condition such as output power (energy flux), number of pulses and pulse width, etc. to increase

(or decrease) the resistor value as claimed in claim 55. Applicant contend that Basseches et al. in view of Poisel and Mochizuki et al. does not teach or suggest the resistor size not exceed about one micron. This is not found persuasive because merely change in size is not patentable, see MPEP § 2144.04 as follow:

In re Rose , 220 F.2d 459, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955) (Claims directed to a lumber package "of appreciable size and weight requiring handling by a lift truck" where held unpatentable over prior art lumber packages which could be lifted by hand because limitations relating to the size of the package were not sufficient to patentably distinguish over the prior art.); In re Rinehart, 531 F.2d 1048, 189 USPQ 143 (CCPA 1976) ("mere scaling up of a prior art process capable of being scaled up, if such were the case, would not establish patentability in a claim to an old process so scaled." 531 F.2d at 1053, 189 USPQ at 148.). In Gardner v. TEC Systems, Inc., 725 F.2d 1338, 220 USPQ 777 (Fed. Cir. 1984), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 830, 225 USPQ 232 (1984), the Federal Circuit held that, where the only difference between the prior art and the claims was a recitation of relative dimensions of the claimed device and a device having the claimed relative dimensions would not perform differently than the prior art device, the claimed device was not patentably distinct from the prior art device.

And, Mochizuki et al. teaches at col. 5, lines 1-13, forming a resistor portion of less than one micron.

Basseches et al. clearly teaches at fig. 2 and col. 2, lines 10-71, lines 45-60, col. 2, lines 38-45, forming an anodization electrical circuit which includes: a DC power supply, an electrolytic solution comprising oxygen (water, nitric, acetic. Citric, oxalic acid, nitric acid HNO_3 containing NO_3 gas particles), the resistor partially immersed in the electrolytic solution, and a cathode partially immersed in the electrolytic solution, wherein the resistor (with an resistance layer, col. 2, lines 10-11) is electrically coupled to a positive terminal of the DC power supply such that the resistor serves as an anode, and wherein the cathode is electrically coupled to a negative terminal of the DC power supply, activating the DC power supply such that the DC power supply generates a voltage output, wherein the voltage output causes an electrolytic reaction

Art Unit: 2812

in the electrolytic solution near the resistor, wherein the electrolytic reaction generates **oxygen** ions from the oxygen in the electrolytic solution, and wherein the oxygen particles include the oxygen ions; and oxidizing the fraction of the surface layer with the **oxygen ions** to increase the resistance of resistor (see col. 2, lines 37-54) as set forth above. Basseches clearly teaches at col. 2, lines 39-55, col. 3, lines 3-60, and table 1, testing (monitoring with monitor means 10) the resistor 3 during the oxidizing step to determine the desired resistance has been attained. Regarding claim 66, 59, merely change in size is not patentable, see MPEP § 2144.04. And, Wang clearly teaches at col.4, lines 1-17, using ion beam radiation and nitrogen to change the resistivity of a resistor. And, Blanchard clearly teaches at col. 3, lines 23-36, using electron beam radiation to change the resistivity of a resistor


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to H. Jey Tsai whose telephone number is (571) 272-1684. The examiner can normally be reached on from 7:00 Am to 4:00 Pm., Monday thru Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael S. Lebentritt can be reached on (571) 272-1873.

The fax phone number for this Group is 571-273-8300.

hjt

11/6/2006



H. Jey Tsai
Primary Examiner
Patent Examining Group 2800